

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/624,513	Applicant(s) KAYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Feben M. Haile	Art Unit 2616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Feben M. Haile.

(3) Andrew Harry.

(2) Aung Moe.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 23 May 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tsunehara et al. (US 6,907,260), and Kuo et al. (US 6,542,718).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of references as applied to the claims, and Applicant's representative provided further explanation to indicate the difference between the cited prior art and their own invention. d.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Aung S. Moe/
SPE 2616

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required